

PROPOSED LOWER HUTT DISTRICT PLAN: RESIDENTIAL AND RURAL ZONES (HEARING STREAM 3)

HEARING SUMMARY STATEMENT

SAMUEL GODWIN ON BEHALF OF SILVERSTREAM PARK CHRISTIAN CENTRE

(CIVIL ENGINEERING)

- 1.1. My name is Samuel Godwin. I am a director and chartered civil engineer at Cuttriss Consultants Limited. I have provided civil engineering evidence on behalf of Silverstream Park Christian Centre.
- 1.2. I do not intend to repeat my evidence in full. I will focus on the servicing matters that remain in issue following Council's rebuttal evidence.
- 1.3. My overall opinion remains that the servicing matters identified in the section 42A report do not provide a fundamental civil engineering reason to reject the rezoning relief in full.
- 1.4. I agree with Mr Aitchison that wastewater, stormwater and flood risk can be addressed through future consenting processes. I understand that his remaining engineering concern relates to water supply for the southern portion of 320 Eastern Hutt Road.
- 1.5. In relation to water supply, I will reiterate Paragraph 3.20 and 3.21 of my evidence that I believe Council's statements do not fully reflect the current servicing position.

- 1.6. Mr Aitchison acknowledges in his rebuttal in Paragraph 26 that some parts of the site are serviced from the public system. For clarity, the part of the site that is in fact serviced from the public system is the southern area of 320 Eastern Hutt Road. There is a Council-owned 150mm diameter water main immediately adjacent to the site boundary.
- 1.7. In my opinion, the southern land proposed for future residential development is therefore the more straightforward part of the site from a water supply perspective. I would add that this means the southern portion does not require reliance on the existing private water supply ownership and maintenance model that applies to parts of the established Retreat. A connection could be made to the public main and extended through any proposed development of the southern portion which sits approximately 30m to 55m below the Kingsly Reservoir Top Water Level, showing adequate pressure could be provided by the current council network. Hydrants could be provided from the council gravity network to adequately service the site for firefighting, which would address Mr Aitchison's concerns raised in Paragraph 32 of his evidence.
- 1.8. I accept that further engineering investigation would be required before any future residential subdivision or land use development could proceed. However, I do not agree that the need for that further work is, of itself, a civil engineering reason to retain the Large Lot Residential Zone over the southern portion of the site.
- 1.9. In my opinion, the issue is not whether water supply is available, but what final water supply arrangement would be required for a future residential development scenario. That is a matter capable of being addressed through further investigation, detailed design,

infrastructure upgrades or extension, and the usual resource consent and engineering approval processes.

1.10. Accordingly, I remain of the opinion that water supply does not represent a fundamental civil engineering constraint to rezoning.

1.11. Thank you. I am happy to take any questions from the Panel.

Samuel Godwin

Dated 22 June 2026